

Nova-MIN-GEN-76  
D. Ayres  
May 12, 2005

Minutes of the NOvA Institutional Board Meeting at Fermilab  
May 5, 2005

Representatives

Argonne:	Dave Ayres
Athens:	absent
Caltech:	absent
UCLA:	Doug Michael
Fermilab:	John Cooper
College de France:	absent
Harvard:	Gary Feldman
Indiana:	absent
ITEP-Moscow:	absent
Lebedev:	absent
Michigan State:	Carl Bromberg
Minnesota, Duluth:	absent
Minnesota, Minneapolis:	Ken Heller
Munich:	absent
SUNY, Stony Brook:	absent
Northern Illinois:	absent
Ohio:	absent
Ohio State:	absent
Oxford:	absent
Rio de Janeiro:	Hiroshi Nunokawa
Rutherford:	absent
South Carolina:	Carl Rosenfeld
Stanford:	Stan Wojcicki
Texas A&M:	absent
Texas, Austin:	Karol Lang
Tufts:	Tony Mann
Virginia:	absent
Virginia Tech:	absent
Washington:	absent
William & Mary:	Jeff Nelson
Wisconsin:	absent

Peter Litchfield was present as the IB Chair.

1. NOvA Project representation on ExCom. The NOvA experiment received Stage 1 approval following the April PAC meeting and Fermilab will soon set up a NOvA Project organization and appoint a NOvA Project Manager. There was general agreement that the NOvA Project Manager should be an ex-officio member of the NOvA Executive Committee as soon as he or she is appointed. Peter Litchfield and Dave Ayres agreed to to propose the wording for an amendment to the NOvA Bylaws to make this change, for approval at the next IB meeting. It is likely that at least one other member of the NOvA Project organization should also be made an ex-officio ExCom member but this change cannot be made until the structure of the new organization has been established. It was also suggested that the NOvA Project Manager should be asked to attend NOvA Institutional Board meetings.
2. Review of NOvA ExCom elections. There was general agreement that the

NOvA Collaboration election of Executive Committee members had not worked very well. Only about 50% of qualified electors voted, even after the IB Chair extended the deadline because of the very poor initial turnout. The turnout for the Co-Spokesperson election held earlier was also quite low, perhaps because there was no serious contest in that election. Other perceived deficiencies of the ExCom elections were that all the elected members are active MINOS collaborators and that some strong NOvA institutions are not represented on ExCom. Several ways to prevent a recurrence of this situation were discussed: (1) Do nothing. Now that NOvA is approved, people will become more involved and the next elections will work better. (2) Change to the MINOS system where the IB elects ExCom members. (3) Add additional elected members to the ExCom to make it easier for more institutions to be represented. After some discussion the IB agreed that two more elected members should be added to the ExCom by electing four members to replace the three members whose terms expire in each of the next two annual elections. Peter Litchfield and Dave Ayres agreed to propose wording for an amendment to the NOvA Bylaws to make this change, for approval at the next IB meeting.

3. NOvA Collaboration Email list. One factor in the poor voter turnout at the NOvA elections may have been the fact that some qualified electors were not on the NOvA Email distribution list. John Cooper passed out copies of the current Email list and asked IB members to check and correct the names and Email addresses for their institutions. There was general agreement with John's proposal to construct two non-overlapping Email lists. One would include only active NOvA collaborators and the other would include people with more casual interests in the experiment.
4. Procedure for admitting new institutions. The approval of NOvA and the decision by DOE to close out several major experiments over the next few years has prompted a number of inquiries from groups who wish to join the NOvA Collaboration. The NOvA Bylaws specify that the IB cannot admit a new institution to the collaboration during the same meeting at which its application is presented. This delay could make it difficult for new institutions to incorporate NOvA into their grant renewal applications in a timely fashion. In addition, the proposed schedule for NOvA requires an immediate, rapid ramp-up of effort on the experiment. The IB agreed to modify the procedure for admitting institutions to NOvA by allowing IB approval of applications during the same collaboration meeting at which they are presented. An IB Email discussion of a proposal prior to that meeting may be used to expedite this process. Peter Litchfield and Dave Ayres agreed to propose wording for an amendment to the NOvA Bylaws to make these changes, for approval at the next IB meeting.